REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF TPM 20778RPL³, LOG NO 03-20-007; Pijnenburg

August 31, 2006

I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion:							
While the proposed project and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.							
<u>II. MSCP/BMO</u> - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion:							
The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.							
III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion:							

As identified within Section 67.722B of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance, it has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Article IV, Sections 1 & 2) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Article IV, Section 5)?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Section 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains an RPO wetland, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. The entire area of wetland along with a wetland buffer will be placed in an open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first. There will be no net loss of wetlands and therefore no significant impact will occur.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not within the floodways, flood plain fringe as defined in the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be place in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are steep slopes on the property however, an open space easement is proposed over the entire steep slope lands. Therefore, the project is in conformance with the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Megan Hamilton on November 16, 2004. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The property has been surveyed by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist/historian (or County of San Diego staff archaeologist/historian) and it has been determined there are two historical site(s). Testing and other investigation determined the historical sites do not meet the definition of significant site. It does not need to be preserved under the Resource Protection Ordinance.

V. STORMWATE	ER ORDINA	NCE (WPO)	- Does the project comply	with the County of
San Diego Water Ordinance (WPO		tion, Stormwa	ater Management and Disc	charge Control
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	
Discussion:				
DPW has reviewe same.	ed the SWM	P received Ju	ine 6, 2004 by DPLU and I	nas accepted
			ct comply with the County County of San Diego Noi	•
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	

Discussion:

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

August 31, 2006

Even though the proposal could expose people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County General Plan or Noise Ordinance), the following noise mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the noise impacts to applicable limits: dedication of a noise protection easement 300 feet on either side of Highway 94.

ND08-06\0320007-ORDCHKLST;jcr